January 14, 2005

Ms. Jerris Penrod Mapes Assistant City Attorney City of Killeen P.O. Box 1329 Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2005-00504

Dear Ms. Mapes:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 217023.

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a request for information relating to police report numbers 04-009690 and 04-006413. You inform us that the city is releasing report number 04-009690 in its entirety, along with basic information with regard to report number 04-006413. See Gov't Code § 552.108(c); Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston, 531 S.W.2d 177, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976). You claim that the rest of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the information you submitted.

We first note that the submitted information includes affidavits for arrest warrants and complaints. As amended by the 78th Legislature, article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides:

The arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, is public information, and beginning immediately when the warrant is executed the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the warrant and the affidavit available for public inspection in the

clerk's office during normal business hours. A person may request the clerk to provide copies of the warrant and affidavit on payment of the cost of providing the copies.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 15.26. As a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not apply to information that is made public by other statutes. See Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Therefore, to the extent that the affidavits that we have marked were presented to a magistrate in support of the issuance of an arrest warrant, the affidavits must be released under article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. To the extent that the affidavits were not so presented, they must be disposed of in accordance with the rest of this ruling.

With regard to the complaints, article 15.04 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that "[t]he affidavit made before the magistrate or district or county attorney is called a 'complaint' if it charges the commission of an offense" (emphasis added). Crim. Proc. Code art. 15.26. Case law indicates that a complaint can support the issuance of an arrest warrant. See Janecka v. State, 739 S.W.2d 813, 822-23 (Tex. Crim. App. 1987); Villegas v. State, 791 S.W.2d 226, 235 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi1990, pet. ref'd); Borsari v. State, 919 S.W.2d 913, 918 (Tex. App.—Houston [14 Dist.] 1996, pet. ref'd) (discussing well-established principle that complaint in support of arrest warrant need not contain same particularity required of indictment). Therefore, to the extent that the complaints that we have marked were presented to a magistrate in support of the issuance of an arrest warrant, they must be released under article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. To the extent that the marked complaints were not so presented, they must be disposed of in accordance with the rest of this ruling.

Next, we address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. This section prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires the governmental body to ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions to disclosure that it claims not later than the tenth business day after the date of its receipt of the written request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Section 552.301(e) requires the governmental body to submit to the attorney general, not later than the fifteenth business day after the date of its receipt of the request, (1) written comments stating why the governmental body's claimed exceptions apply to the information that it seeks to withhold; (2) a copy of the request for information; (3) a signed statement of the date on which the governmental body received the request, or evidence sufficient to establish that date; and (4) the specific information that the governmental body seeks to withhold or representative samples of the information if it is voluminous. See id. § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). Section 552.302 provides that if a governmental body does not request an attorney general decision as prescribed by section 552.301, the requested information is presumed to be subject to required public disclosure and must be released, unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information. See id. § 552.302.

You indicate that the city received the present request for information on October 21, 2004. Your request for this decision, as meter-marked on November 5, 2004, was not made within the ten-business-day period prescribed by section 552.301(b). Thus, as the city did not comply with section 552.301 in requesting this decision, the submitted information is presumed to be public and must be released, unless there is a compelling reason to withhold any of the information. See id. § 552.302; Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins., 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can generally be overcome by a demonstration that the information is confidential by law or that third-party interests are at stake. See Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Section 552.108 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to public disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. See Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). The city's claim under section 552.108 is not a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302. See Open Records Decision No. 586 at 2-3 (1991). In failing to comply with section 552.301, the city has waived section 552.108. See Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions). However, the claim under section 552.108 of a governmental body other than the one that failed to comply with section 552.301 can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302. See Open Records Decision No. 586 at 3 (1991) (interests of another law enforcement agency under statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 overcame failure of governmental body that received request for information to timely seek attorney general decision). In this instance, you state that the Bell County Attorney's Office has a prosecutorial interest in the information at issue. Therefore, we will determine whether the city may withhold this information on behalf of the county attorney under section 552.108.

Section 552.108 excepts from public disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. See id. § 552.301(e)(1)(A); Ex parte Pruitt, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). You state that report number 04-006413 relates to a case that is pending for prosecution at the county attorney's office. You also inform us that the county attorney has asked that the remaining information in report number 04-006413 be withheld at this time. Based on your representations, we find that release of the information in question would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. See Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston, 531 S.W.2d at 186-88 (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases); Open Records Decision No. 372 (1983) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 could be invoked by any proper custodian of information relating to incident involving allegedly criminal conduct that remained under active investigation or prosecution). We therefore conclude that the city may withhold the remaining information in report number 04-006413 under section 552.108(a)(1).

In summary: (1) the arrest warrant affidavits and complaints must be released under article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to the extent that they were submitted to a magistrate in support of the issuance of an arrest warrant; and (2) the city may withhold the remaining information in report number 04-006413 under section 552.108(a)(1).

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be

sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

James W. Morris, III

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

JWM/sdk

Ref: ID# 217023

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Cleo D. Johnson

4300 Alan Kent #D Killeen, Texas 76549

(w/o enclosures)